

|   |                        |                     |  |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|   | 09/992,922             | TRAJKOVIC, MIROSLAV |  |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|   | DANIEL G. MARIAM       | 2625                |  |

**All Participants:**

(1) DANIEL G. MARIAM.

(2) STEVE PETERSON.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 26 August 2005

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*35 USC 103*

**Claims discussed:**

*independent claims 1, 8, and 15*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*Guo, et al. (6,353,678)*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
**DANIEL MIRIAM**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed issues pertinent to the above-identified claims in light of the newly surfaced prior art of Guo, et al. Applicant's Attorney, namely Steve Peterson has agreed to amend the claims to further distinguish the claimed invention from the combined teaching of Szeliski and Guo, et al. (See the Examiner's Amendment for details).